

JEFFER, MANGELS, BUTLER & MARMARO LLP
MARTIN H. ORLICK (Bar No. 083908), MHO@jmbm.com
MATTHEW S. KENEFICK (Bar No. 227298), MSK@jmbm.com
Two Embarcadero Center, Fifth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3824
Telephone: (415) 398-8080
Facsimile: (415) 398-5584

Attorneys for Defendants CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO and CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO UPTOWN
PARKING CORPORATION, a California Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

CRAIG YATES,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNION SQUARE; CITY AND COUNTY OF
SAN FRANCISCO, CITY OF SAN
FRANCISCO UPTOWN PARKING
CORPORATION; EMPORIO RULLI IL
CAFFE UNION SQ.; EMPORIO RULLI IL
CAFFE UNION SQ., INC.; and DOES 1
through 50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C074087EDI

**NOTICE OF MOTION; MOTION FOR THE
COURT TO DECLINE SUPPLEMENTAL
JURISDICTION OVER AND TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFF'S STATE LAW CLAIMS [28
U.S.C. § 1367(c)] AND TO STRIKE
PLAINTIFF'S UNSUPPORTED AND
IMPROPER DAMAGE PRAYERS FROM
THE COMPLAINT [FRCP 12(f)]**

Accompanying Papers: Memorandum of Points
and Authorities; Request for Judicial Notice;
(Proposed) Order

Date: November 6, 2007
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept: Crtrm. E
Judge: The Hon. Elizabeth D. Laporte

Complaint filed: August 9, 2007
Trial date: none set

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE: that on November 6, 2007, at 9:00 a.m., before the
Honorable Elizabeth D. Laporte in Court Room E of the above-referenced court located at 450
Golden Gate Ave., 15th Floor, San Francisco, California, Defendants City and County of San
Francisco ("CCSF") and City of San Francisco Uptown Parking Corporation, a California

corporation ("Uptown") (collectively, "Moving Parties") will, and hereby do, make a motion to this Court for the Court to Decline Supplemental Jurisdiction Over and to Dismiss Plaintiff's State Law Claims [28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)] and to Strike Plaintiff's Unsupported and Improper Damage Prayers from the Complaint [FRCP 12(f)] (the "Motion").

By this Motion, Moving Parties request the Court, because of irreconcilable interpretations between the California state and federal courts of the requirements for entitlement to statutory damages under the California Unruh Civil Rights Act, decline to extend supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims and dismiss the same. 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, 12(f), Moving Parties also request the Court strike out the following portions of the Complaint as un-supported and improper damage prayers:

Requests For Damages Under Title II Of The ADA:

As a result of such discrimination, in violation of section 202 of the ADA, plaintiff is entitled to the remedies, procedures and rights set forth in section 505 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. §794a), as provided by section 203 of the ADA, including injunctive relief and damages for violation of his civil rights, as previously plead.

Complaint ¶ 24 p.11 line 27 through p.12 line 4.

Plaintiff requests appropriate damages for each of his complained experiences for the two year period preceding the filing of this complaint, as well as litigation expenses and costs, and reasonable attorneys' fees as provided by law.

Complaint ¶ 26, p.12 lines 10-14.

Award damages against the government entity defendants pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Complaint, Prayer for Relief, p.39 lines 15-17.

Requests For Damages Under Section 504 Of The Rehabilitation Act:

Plaintiff seeks damages for the ongoing and continuous denial of his Civil Rights from the date of his initial attempts to use the square, or the dates he was deterred (preceding back to two years before the filing of the original complaint) to the time of trial or remediation, and for physical, mental and emotional injury, all to his damages according to proof.

Complaint ¶ 32, p.14 lines 21-27

JMBM
Jeffer Mangels
Butler & Marmaro LLP

Award damages against all defendants pursuant to section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

Complaint, Prayer for Relief, p.39 lines 13-14.

Requests For Attorneys' Fees And Litigation Costs Under California Code Of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5:

...justifying "public interest" attorneys' fees pursuant to the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.

Complaint ¶ 47, p.22 lines 9-10.

Plaintiff further request that the court award statutory attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs to plaintiff pursuant to section 19953 Health & Safety Code, Civil Code section 55, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, all hereinafter prayed for.

Complaint ¶ 61, p.27 lines 1-5.

...justifying "public interest" attorneys' fees pursuant to the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.

Complaint ¶ 76, p.32 lines 26-28.

...plaintiff seeks attorneys' fees pursuant to section 1021.5 California Code of Civil Procedure...

Complaint ¶ 80, p.34 lines 6-7.

...justifying "public interest" attorneys' fees pursuant to the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.

Complaint ¶ 84, p.35 lines 15-17.

...plaintiff seeks attorneys' fees pursuant to section 1021.5 California Code of Civil Procedure...

Complaint ¶ 89, p.36 lines 19-20.

Award all costs of this proceeding and all reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs as provided by law, including but not limited to those recoverable pursuant to the provisions of section 54.3 and 55 Civil Code, section 1021.5 Code of Civil Procedure...

Complaint Prayer for Relief, p.39 lines 20-24.

This Motion is based upon this notice and motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for the Court to Decline Supplemental Jurisdiction Over and to Dismiss Plaintiff's State Law Claims [28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)] and to Strike Plaintiff's Unsupported and Improper Damage Prayers from the Complaint [FRCP 12(f)] filed and served

1 concurrently herewith, the accompanying Request for Judicial Notice in Support of Motion for the
2 Court to Decline Supplemental Jurisdiction Over and to Dismiss Plaintiff's State Law Claims [28
3 U.S.C. § 1367(c)] and to Strike Plaintiff's Unsupported and Improper Damage Prayers from the
4 Complaint [FRCP 12(f)] filed and served concurrently herewith, as well as the complete files and
5 records of this action and on such other and further evidence, arguments, and authorities as may be
6 submitted prior to and during the hearing on this Motion.

7 DATED: September 28, 2007

JEFFER, MANGELS, BUTLER & MARMARO LLP
MARTIN H. ORLICK
MATTHEW S. KENEFICK

9
10 By: /S/ Martin H. Orlick

MARTIN H. ORLICK
Attorneys for Defendant CITY AND COUNTY OF
SAN FRANCISCO AND CITY OF SAN
FRANCISCO UPTOWN PARKING
CORPORATION, a California corporation

JMBM
Jeffer Mangels
Butler & Marmaro LLP